

## *REMARKS*

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-18 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 13 are independent.

Claim 13 has been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### *Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119*

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

### *Information Disclosure Citation*

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 1, 2002, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

*Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection*

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,280 to Park, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,357 to Dojo et al. (Dojo). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

The Applicants' independent claim 1 recites a pixel electrode on the passivation layer to electrically connect the first, second and third line layers through each contact hole. Independent claim 13, as amended, recites forming a pixel electrode on the passivation layer to electrically connect the drain electrode and the first, second and third line layers through the contact holes.

It is evident from the above-recited portions of the Applicants' claims that the claimed device features multiple contact holes. It is also evident that the pixel electrode of the Applicants' claimed device connects the first, second and third line layers through the multiple contact holes.

By contrast, Park does not teach multiple contact holes. Further, Park does not teach first, second and third line layers, which are each connected to the same pixel electrode through the multiple contact holes. Rather, Park teaches a reflective electrode 68, which is a connecting point between a pixel electrode 70 and a drain electrode (through a single contact hole).

Further, the Applicants' independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements in an LCD device having *an input line part* including at least the features recited above. In both independent claims 1 and 13, the first, second and third line layers are *formed in the input line part*. Park fails to disclose or even suggest this feature. In particular, Park teaches a gate line, a data line and a reflective electrode, which are all formed in, or disposed in a cell array region.

Therefore, Park fails to disclose or suggest a combination of elements in an LCD device *having an input line part*, including a passivation layer formed on the substrate, having respective contact holes therein located at the first, second and third line layers; and a pixel electrode on the passivation layer to electrically connect the first, second and third line layers through each contact hole, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly stated in independent claim 13 (as amended). Further, Park fails to disclose or suggest a combination of elements in a method for manufacturing an LCD device having a cell array region and an *input line part*, including forming a gate line on a substrate of the cell array region, simultaneously, and a first line layer on the substrate at the input line part, and forming respective contact holes to expose the drain electrode of the cell array region, and surfaces of the first, second and third line layers of the input line part, as recited in independent claim 13, as amended. Dojo cannot supply the deficiencies of Park.

With regard to dependent claims 2-12 and 14-18, Applicants submit that claims 2-12 and 14-18 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 13, which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-12 and 14-18 are allowable based on their dependence from claims 1 and 13. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

### *Conclusion*

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084, at (703) 205-8034, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/029,146  
Art Unit: 2871

Attorney Docket No. 0465-0884P  
Amendment filed December 29, 2003  
Page 10

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By:



James T. Eller, Jr.  
Reg. No.: 39,538

JTE:PLS

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
Telephone: (703)205-8000

0465-0884P